

**REMARKS**

Claims 1-28 are pending in the present application. No claims have been cancelled, amended or added. Therefore, after entry of the above amendments, claims 1-28 will be pending in this application. Applicants believe that the present application is now in condition for allowance, which prompt and favorable action is respectfully requested.

**I. REJECTION UNDER 35 U.S.C. §102**

Claims 1-16 and 22-28 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Leclereq, U.S. Patent Publication No. 2004/0248624 (hereinafter “Leclereq”). The rejection is respectfully traversed.

The office action asserts that Leclereq discloses a method and apparatus as per claims 1-16 and 22-28. However, Applicants submit that Leclereq does not disclose “synchronizing a new second wakeup time to said next first communications wakeup time when said next first communications wakeup time is earlier than a next second wakeup time” as Claim 1 recites.

Leclereq describes “the wakeup signals from the clock domain blocks and the software wake up block 335 may be combined via an OR gate 340 ... assuring that if one or more of the clock domain blocks (or the mobile telephone) is waking up, then the VCDG 305 will also be woken up” [0037]. Thus, Leclereq describes logically ORing all of the clock domain block wakeup signals together with an OR gate in order to wake up the master clock generator (VCDG); if any one of the wakeup clocks tells the VCDG to wakeup, then it will. Leclereq does not describe synchronizing the wakeup clocks and does not disclose or teach anywhere “synchronizing a new second wakeup time to said next first communications wakeup time when said next first communications wakeup time is earlier than a next second wakeup time” as Claim 1 recites.

Therefore, Leclereq does not teach or disclose all of the limitations of Claim 1. Therefore Claim 1 is patentable. Claims 2, 9, 14, 25, 26, and 28 contain similar limitations as to Claim 1, and for at least the same reasons as stated for Claim 1, claims 2, 9, 14, 25, 26, and 28 are patentable.

Claims 3-8 depend from patentable Claim 2. Therefore, dependant claims 3-8 are patentable based on their dependency upon patentable Claim 2 and other novel features contained therein.

Claims 10-13 depend from patentable Claim 9. Therefore, dependant claims 10-13 are patentable based on their dependency upon patentable Claim 9 and other novel features contained therein.

Claims 15-16 and 22-24 depend from patentable Claim 14. Therefore, dependant claims 15-16 and 22-24 are patentable based on their dependency upon patentable Claim 14 and other novel features contained therein.

Claim 28 depends from patentable Claim 27. Therefore, dependant Claim 28 is patentable based on its dependency upon patentable Claim 27 and other novel features contained therein.

For at least the foregoing reasons, Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the rejection under 35 U.S.C. §102.

## **II. REJECTION UNDER 35 U.S.C. §103**

Claims 17-21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being anticipated by Leclereq, U.S. Patent Publication No. 2004/0248624 (hereinafter “Leclereq”), and in further view of Lee U.S. Patent No. 6,741,836 (hereafter “Lee”). The rejection is respectfully traversed.

As stated with respect to Claim 1, Leclereq does not teach or disclose all of the limitations of Claim 1.

Thus, Claim 1 is patentable. Claim 14 contains similar limitations as to Claim 1, and for the same reasons as stated with respect to Claim 1, Claim 14 is patentable.

Claims 17-21 depend from patentable Claim 14. Therefore, dependant claims 17-21 are patentable based on their dependency upon patentable Claim 14 and other novel features contained therein.

For at least the foregoing reasons, Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the rejection under 35 U.S.C. §103.

**DISQUALIFICATION OF PRIOR ART UNDER 35 U.S.C. §103(C)**

Applicants submit that Lee U.S. Patent No. 6,741,836 should be disqualified as prior art according to 35 U.S.C. §103(c) as it was commonly assigned to Qualcomm Inc. at the time the present invention was made.

For at least the foregoing reason, Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the rejection under 35 U.S.C. §103(a).

**CONCLUSION**

In light of the amendments contained herein, Applicants submit that the application is in condition for allowance, for which early action is requested.

Please charge any fees or overpayments that may be due with this response to Deposit Account No. 17-0026.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: June 27, 2007

By: /Donald C. Kordich/  
Kenyon Jenckes, Reg. No. 41,873  
(858) 651-8149

QUALCOMM Incorporated  
5775 Morehouse Drive  
San Diego, California 92121  
Telephone: (858) 651-4125  
Facsimile: (858) 658-2502